

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-24, 28-36, 38-42, and 45-48 are pending prior to amending the application.

The examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-6, 14-21, 28-35 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,016) in view of Biba (U.S. Patent No. 4,521,891) and Sinibaldi (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,232).

The examiner rejects claims 3 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger, Biba, and Sinibaldi in view of Green (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,762).

The examiner rejects claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger, Biba, and Sinibaldi in view of Osler (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,222).

The examiner rejects claims 36 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger, Biba and Sinibaldi in view of Rezaiifar (U.S. Patent No. 6,408,003) and Haymond (U.S. Patent No. 4,987,571).

The examiner rejects claims 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,016 to Bellenger, Biba, Sinibaldi, and Rezaiifar

The examiner rejects claims 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger, Biba, Rezaiifar, and Haymond.

The examiner rejects claims 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellenger, Biba, Sinibaldi, Rezaiifar, Haymond, and Osler

Applicant amends claims 1, 14, 19, and 22. Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-24, 28-36, 38-42, and 45-48 remain after amending the application. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

Examiner Interview

The applicant thanks Examiners Chang for granting and conducting an applicant-initiated interview. During the interview, the examiner and applicant were in substantial agreement that claims 28, 36, and 45 were novel and not obvious over the prior art of record. The examiner further indicated that independent claims 1, 14, 19, and 22 would also be novel and not obvious over the prior art of record if amended to include limitations similar to those presented in claim 28.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Applicant respectfully submits this amendment as a supplement to a previous Office Action response, filed on 3/29/2006, which was fully responsive to the examiner's present rejections.


The applicant amends claims 1, 14, 19, and 22 to include limitations similar to those that the examiner indicated as novel and not obvious over the prior art of record. Since the examiner and applicant are in substantial agreement that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest claims 1, 14, 19, and 22 as amended, applicant respectfully requests the present rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed to issue.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance all claims after amending the application is solicited. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575